

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/876,690	06/07/2001	Brian Collamore	US010390	8205	
24737 7590 01/25/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			TOMASZEWSKI, MICHAEL		
BRIARCLIFF I	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			3626		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/25/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/876,690	COLLAMORE ET AL					
↓ Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Mike Tomaszewski	3626					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 20 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. 							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because							
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	ice because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
10. [
	,	And 7	free				
	0	JOSEPH/THO) Mas				
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office	SU ₁	PERVISORY PATEN	IT EXAMINER				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) deemed to be admitted prior art.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

On pages 10-13 of the 12/20/07 response, Applicant argues that Judd, Myers, Rapaport and Official Notice do not teach Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant also traverses Examiner's application of Official Notice as being erroneous.

In response, Examiner respectfully submits that the prior art applied, namely, Judd does teach the features claimed in Applicant's instant invention and that Official Notice was properly used, as applied in claim 1.

First, Judd teaches a medical management system with an information acquisition device (Judd: [0065]), a means for notifiying a user of the arrival of new medical information (Judd: [0066], and memory for storying said information (Judd: [0075] - [0078]). Examiner also notes that one of ordinary skill in the art is well apprised that flagging various information, namely, the arrival of new information, etc.

Second, Examiner notes that in order to adequately traverse an Official Notice finding, the Applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art [Emphasis added]. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also Chevenard, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 ("[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention."). Moreover, if Applicant does not traverse the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice or Applicant's traverse is not adequate, the Examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office Action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because Applicant either failed to traverse the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice or that the traverse was inadequate. If the traverse was inadequate, the Examiner should include an explanation as to why it was inadequate.

Accordingly, Examiner respectfully submits that Applicant's traverse of Official Notice was inadequate because Applicant did not state why

the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. As such, the features rejected via Official Notice are

All remaining arguments rehash issues addressed in previous Office Actions and incorporated herein. As such, the rejections are hereby maintained.